DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 229 TM 032 374

AUTHOR Highlen, Pamela S.; Bean, Mary Clay; Sampson, Mark G.
TITLE Preliminary Development of the Gay and Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency and Effect (GALOSI-F & -E).
PUB DATE 2000-08-07
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (108th, Washington, D.C., August 4-8, 2000). Contains areas of light print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Higher Education; *Homosexuality; *Measures (Individuals); *Social Discrimination; Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS Exploratory Factor Analysis

ABSTRACT

This paper is the first of a series reporting on the development and validation of the Gay and Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency and the Gay and Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Effect (GALOSI-F and GALOSI-E). To generate items, 8 focus groups of lesbians (n=13) and gay men (n=19) were conducted. An expert panel of three lesbians and one gay man evaluated the items developed. The GALOSI was posted on a Web page until 607 respondents completed the inventory. Missing data, which resulted when participants chose the "nonapplicable" response option, precluded the use of exploratory factor analysis for the entire data set. Separate exploratory factor analyses and reliability estimates were conducted for each of seven hypothesized GALOSI factors. Items were assigned to the following categories based on the examination of the first GALOSI data set and the literature: (1) Couples Issues; (2) Danger to Safety; (3) Exclusion, Rejection, and Separation; (4) Internalized Homonegativity; (5) Restricted Opportunities and Rights; (6) Stigmatizing and Stereotyping; and (7) Verbal Harassment and Intimidation. Through these analyses, the GALOSI-F was reduced to 49 items and the GALOSI-E was reduced to 47 items. For both instruments, Couples Issues and Restricted Opportunities and Rights scales evidenced problems, suggesting that these two scales need to be refined. However, for the remaining five scales, adequate preliminary scale structure and reliabilities were obtained. For the GALOSI-F, alphas ranged from 0.63 to 0.88; for the GALOSI-E, alphas ranged from 0.77 to 0.93. Neither the GALOSI-F nor the GALOSI-E was significantly correlated with socially desirable responding. Additional studies are underway to examine the structural and convergent validity of the GALOSI. (Contains 3 tables and 18 references.) (Author/SLD)

ENTIRE DOCUMENT: POOR PRINT QUALITY

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

Running Head: PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT

ED 449 229

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P.S. Highlen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Preliminary Development of the Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency and Effect (GALOSI-F & -E)

Pamela S. Highlen, Mary Clay Bean, and Mark G. Sampson

The Ohio State University

We wish to thank the lesbians and gay men who participated in the focus groups and those who participated in this study. We also wish to thank Kevin Smith and Jon-Patrick Thompson for their assistance in data collection.

This paper was presented as a poster session August 7, 2000, at the 108th American Psychological Association Annual Convention in Washington, D. C.

Correspondence concerning this research should be addressed to Pamela S. Highlen, Department of Psychology, 1885 Neil Avenue Mall, Columbus, OH 43210-1222. Electronic mail may be sent to highlen.1@osu.edu.

IMU32374

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper is a report on the first in a series of studies to develop and validate the Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency and Effect (GALOSI-F & -E). Missing data, which resulted when participants chose the Non-Applicable response option, precluded the use of exploratory factor analysis for the entire data set. Therefore, separate exploratory factor analyses and reliability estimates were conducted for each of seven hypothesized GALOSI factors. Items were assigned to the following categories based on examination of the first GALOSI data set and of the literature: Couples Issues, Danger to Safety, Exclusion, Rejection, and Separation, Internalized Homonegativity, Restricted Opportunities and Rights, Stigmatizing and Stereotyping, and Verbal Harassment and Intimidation. Through these analyses, the GALOSI-F was reduced to 49 items, and the GALOSI-E was reduced to 47 items. For both the GALOSI-F & -E, Couples Issues and Restricted Opportunities and Rights scales evidenced problems, suggesting that these two scales need to be refined. However, for the remaining five scales, adequate preliminary scale structure and reliabilities were obtained. For the GALOSI-F alphas ranged from .63 to .88; for the GALOSI-E, alphas ranged from .77 to .93. Neither the GALOSI-F nor the GALOSI-E was significantly correlated with socially desirable responding. Additional studies are underway to examine the structural and convergent validity of the GALOSI.

Preliminary Development of the Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency and Effect (GALOSI-F & E)

August 7, 2000

Minority individuals are continually confronted with the "isms" that pervade our society including racism, sexism, classism, and heterosexism. Lesbians and gay males, like other stigmatized minority groups, are vulnerable to chronic stressors related to their minority status (Brooks, 1981; Meyer, 1995). The minority stress hypothesis states that lesbians and gay males are exposed to chronic biopsychosocial heterosexist stressors (Brooks, 1981; Meyer, 1995). This stigmatization is based upon heterosexism, which Herek (1992) defines "as an ideological system that denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes any nonheterosexual form of behavior, identity, relationship, or community" (p. 89). Herek (1992) distinguishes between cultural and psychological heterosexism. Cultural heterosexism occurs at the institutional level, such as through the law, religion, and the media. It is common knowledge that most religions condemn homosexuality, and in most states in this country discrimination based on sexual orientation is not protected, thus leading to restricted rights and opportunities for lesbians and gay men. In the mass media, lesbians and gay men are rarely portrayed, and when they are, the focus is on their sexuality rather than on the totality of their lives (Herek, 1992). In contrast, psychological heterosexism occurs at the individual level in terms of a person's heterosexist attitudes and actions (Herek, 1992). Individual heterosexism involves activities such as threats of physical harm, violence, verbal harassment, prejudice, exclusion, and avoidance.

Cultural and individual heterosexism create chronic stress for lesbians and gay males. For example, in a survey of approximately 2,000 lesbians, Bradford, Ryan, and Rothblum (1994) reported that over half of the lesbians surveyed felt too nervous to accomplish ordinary activities

and over one-third had been depressed at some time during the past year, and half had had thoughts of suicide at some time in their life. In order to test the minority stress hypothesis, however, research on lesbians and gay males must control for general life stressors. Several recent studies have directly tested the minority stress hypothesis, and the results have demonstrated the debilitating effects that heterosexism can have on lesbians and gay males. With a sample of approximately 700 New York City gay men, Meyer (1995) found that gay men who reported high levels of minority stress were two to three times as likely to report high levels of psychological distress. Similarly, Waldo (1999) reported that lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals who had experienced heterosexism in the workplace also reported greater psychological distress and health problems. Self-esteem also can be adversely affected. Frable, Wortman, and Joseph (1997) reported that no matter who initiated oppressive and stigmatizing behavior, "the direct path from gay stigma to positive self-perceptions was always significant and negative" (p. 614). Likewise, Waldo, Hesson-McInnis, and D'Augelli (1998) found that victimization of gays and lesbians led to lower self-esteem, which, in turn, exacerbated psychological distress.

Meyer (1995) identified three processes that are associated with minority stress: (a) internalized homophobia, (b) the expectation of rejection and discrimination, and (c) actual prejudice events. Internalized homophobia is defined as "the internalization of societal antihomosexual attitudes" (Malyon, 1982, cited in Meyer & Dean, 1998; p. 163). However, Ross (1996) prefers the term internalized homonegativity as being more precise, because phobias do not have to occur in order to internalize negative messages about homosexuality. According to Meyer and Dean (1998), internalized homonegativity is the "most insidious of the minority stress processes" and leads to lesbians and gay men introjecting negative societal attitudes, which

result in self devaluation, internalized conflicts, and low self-esteem (p. 161). The second factor, expectations of perceived stigma and labeling, has been related to various adverse effects on lesbians and gay men, such as "learning to hide" and having to be vigilant in constantly monitoring their interactions with members of the dominant culture (Meyer, 1995, p. 41). This vigilant behavior may result in lesbians and gay males having to deal with constant stressors that may adversely affect their health and well-being. The third process associated with minority stress is prejudice events. Actual prejudice events, such as rejection, verbal harassment, discrimination, and violence, are the most explicit forms of minority stress. In a review of 24 studies, Berrill (1992) found that among lesbians, gay males, and bisexuals, 80% had been verbally harassed; 44% had been threatened with violence; 33% had been chased or followed; 17% had been physically assaulted, and 13% had been spat upon. In a recent survey of over 2,000 lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults, Herek, Gillis, and Cogan (1999) reported that one-fifth of women and one-quarter of men had experienced victimization because of their sexual orientation. Males were more likely than females and homosexuals were more likely than bisexuals to have experienced a hate crime. When compared to nonbias crime survivors, lesbian and gay male hate-crime survivors reported more depression, anger, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress. Although few studies have examined racial/ethnic differences in rates of victimization, Comstock (1989) and von Schulthess (1992) found lesbians and gay men of color were at increased risk for violent attack based on their sexual orientation. Indeed, lesbians and gay men of color face multiple "-isms" and "find themselves and their concerns as invisible in scholarly research . . . as they often find themselves in the faces of their respective communities" (Greene, 1996, p. 60). Clearly lesbians and gay men of color must be given a greater voice in lesbian and gay research.

Although violence is the most explicit source of heterosexism (Garnets, Herek, & Levy, 1992), verbal harassment and intimidation have a profound impact because of the deep-seated cultural heterosexism they activate (Brooks, 1981). According to Garnets, Herek, and Levy (1992), anti-gay verbal harassment is a symbolic form of violence that serves as a constant reminder of the threat of physical violence (p. 215). In a study of heterosexism in the workplace, Waldo (1999) found that having a higher proportion of men in the work environment predicted reported experiences of direct heterosexism by lesbians, gays, and bisexuals (LGBs). He also reported that increased outness in the workplace was related to fewer experiences of indirect heterosexism. LGBs who had experienced heterosexism also reported greater psychological distress and health problems, less job satisfaction, more withdrawal from work-related activities, and greater absenteeism. These findings are consistent with the minority stress hypothesis that heterosexism has negative effects on lesbians and gay men.

However, as DiPlacido (1998) noted, although LGBs who are not out may experience fewer prejudice events, they probably experience a significant amount of chronic stress. DiPlacido hypothesized that self-concealment (keeping secrets) and emotional inhibition (e.g., holding back public displays of affection) in LGBs who are not out lead to chronic stress that, in turn, may adversely affect their health and well-being. She is currently testing her hypotheses in the Lesbian and Bisexual Women Stress Project in New York City (DiPlacido, 1998). DiPlacido's work highlights the importance of examining the effects of internalized homonegativity, as well as actual prejudice events, when assessing heterosexism.

Although reports of victimization of gays and lesbians have been well documented, only two instruments have been developed to assess heterosexist situations they experience. The Gay And Lesbian Life Event Scale (GALES; Rosser & Ross, 1989) includes generic life stressors, as

well as some oppressive situations that gays encounter. However, the GALES is limited in its utility, since it was developed with a sample of gay, White, Australian males. The recently developed Workplace Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire (WHEQ; Waldo, 1999) assesses gay male, lesbian, and bisexual employees' workplace experiences of harassment and discrimination based upon their sexual orientation. The 22-item WHEQ assesses heterosexist workplace situations that have been experienced within the past 24 months. Seven items measure indirect heterosexism, such as "made you feel it was necessary for you to 'act straight' [e.g., monitor your speech, dress, or mannerisms], and 15 items measure direct heterosexism, such as "called you a 'dyke,' 'faggot,' 'fence-sitter' or some other slur." The WHEQ provides a psychometrically sound instrument for use in assessing heterosexism in the workplace. However, no instrument exists to assess heterosexist situations lesbians and gay men encounter across settings. Therefore, the purpose of this research was to develop such an instrument based upon actual experiences of racially and ethnically diverse lesbians and gay men. Bisexuals were not included in the development of this instrument because they have some unique characteristics that distinguish them from lesbians and gay men (e.g., potential harassment and rejection by both gays and heterosexuals).

The first study, which is reported in this paper, examined the factor structure and internal consistency of the GALOSI-F & -E. We hypothesized that factor analysis would support the existence of distinct, but interrelated, factors for the GALOSI-F & -E, with each obtaining adequate internal consistency. A preliminary test of the GALOSI's discriminant validity was ascertained by correlating both scale scores with a measure of socially desirable responding. Three studies are currently in progress to examine the GALOSI-F & -E's structural validity, test-retest reliability, and its convergent and discriminant validity. Self-identified lesbians and gay

men who are 18 years of age or older may participate in the GALOSI structural validity and the convergent and discriminant validity studies on-line by going to www.psy.ohio-state.edu/glstudy.

Method

Item Generation

To generate items for the GALOSI, eight focus groups of lesbians (n =13) and gay men (n = 19) 18 years of age and older were conducted in Austin, Texas and Columbus, Ohio. To increase content validity of items generated, gays and lesbians across racial/ethnic groups (African [n = 1], Latino/Latina [n = 3], Biracial [n = 3], European [n = 24], and Native American [n = 1]) were included in these focus groups. Focus group members represented a wide range of income (from $10,000-$14,999 to $75,000+) and education (from high school to graduate degree). Their modal income was between $35,000-$49,999, and the modal education was a college degree. The average age of focus group members was 34.8 (range = 28-50). Twenty-two lived in urban areas; five each resided in suburban and rural locations. Collectively, these focus groups generated approximately 200 oppressive heterosexist situations. Redundant items were eliminated, which resulted in an initial pool of 144 items.

An expert panel consisting of three European American lesbians (36, 30, and 28 years of age) and one biracial gay man (41 years of age) evaluated the 144 GALOSI items. Two experts' annual income was $30,000, and the other two raters' income was over $100,000. The experts independently rated each item on content appropriateness and clarity, using a 5-point scale that ranged from 1 (not at all appropriate or extremely unclear) to 4 (very appropriate or extremely clear). Experts also evaluated the relevance of each situation by rating it as Relevant or Objectionable. A discussion following the independent ratings provided additional suggestions.

Inappropriate, objectionable and poorly worded items then were eliminated, which resulted in 133 items.

Web Page Survey

Measures

A demographic questionnaire, the Impression Management (IM) scale from the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR), and the GALOSI were presented in a fixed order on the web page.

Demographic questionnaire. Questions included the participant's gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, income (current and when growing up in family of origin), type of community live in (family of origin and current), region of USA where currently live, and religious orientation (family of origin and current).

Impression Management (IM) Scale from theBalanced Inventory of Desirable Responding Version 6 (BIDR; Paulhus, 1991). The 20-item Impression Management (IM) scale from the BIDR was used as a measure of discriminant validity. Impression Management is defined as the tendency to over report behaviors that are socially desirable and underreport those that are socially undesirable (e.g., "I sometimes tell lies if I have to"). Participants respond on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1, Not True, to 7, Very True. Negatively keyed items are reverse-scored, extreme responses (i.e., scores of 6 or 7) are assigned 1 point, and all other responses are assigned 0 points. Points are summed, yielding a total score from 0 to 20. IM internal consistency reliability coefficients range from .75 to .86, and for five-week test-retest reliability, r = .65 (Paulhus, 1991).

Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency & Effect (GALOSI-F & -E). The GALOSI consists of 133 heterosexist situations that lesbians and gay men encounter.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Each item is rated on two 5-point Likert scales for Frequency and for Effect. The Frequency Scale ranges from 1 (Never) to 5 (Almost Always). The Effect Scale ranges from 1 (No Effect) to 5 (Extremely Strong Effect). Sample items include "I overhear people telling gay-bashing jokes." and "I have seen the media negatively portray gays and lesbians."

Procedure

Announcements for this web-based study were posted in various university facilities on the researchers' campus. Snowball sampling was also employed locally and through the use of electronic mail, which was sent to personal and professional contacts across the country. Several members of the research team also visited Internet chat rooms to recruit additional participants. The research announcement described an investigation to learn more about the oppressive situations encountered by gays and lesbians. Individuals who were interested in participating were directed to an address on the World Wide Web where they could access the on-line survey. Participants were first provided with a brief description and purpose of the study, followed by who could participate (self-identified lesbians or gay men 18 years of age or older). They were informed that this study had been reviewed by the university's Institutional Review Board and were given an e-mail address where they could contact the first author with any questions or concerns. The possible risks/benefits of participation were then described. Participants were then told that no information that might be traceable back to them was requested, and that once they had completed the questionnaire and clicked the "Finished-Submit" button, their responses would be encoded and stored anonymously on a server at the researchers' university. Participation was described as voluntary and participants could discontinue their participation at any time. Individuals were then presented an informed consent sheet which stated: "I acknowledge that I have been given the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding

the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me." Participants who agreed with the informed consent statement were told that by clicking the "Acknowledge-Continue" button, they confirmed that they were over the age of 18 and had read and fully understood the consent form. Those who clicked "Acknowledge-Continue" were given the survey, which included a short demographic questionnaire, the 20-item Impression Management scale, and the 266-item GALOSI. Participants who wanted a summary of the research findings were directed to a separate file where they could leave their e-mail or mailing address. At the end of the survey, participants were told they could enter a raffle by going to a separate page for an opportunity to win one of three cash prizes (1^{st}--$100, 2^{nd}--$50, 3^{rd}--$25) for the first three randomly chosen names. Raffle identifying information went into a separate file and was not linked to any of the research data.

The GALOSI was posted on a web page until 607 respondents completed the inventory. The GALOSI survey page was then deactivated, and the three raffle winners were chosen.

Participants

Participants were 607 self-identified lesbians (39.2%) or gay men (55.7%) 18 years of age or older, those who chose a sexual orientation other than lesbian or gay male were dropped. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 75 years old (M = 32.05, SD = 14.34). The majority were European Americans (81%), with much smaller percentages of Latino (4%), Biracial (2%), African (1%), Asian (1%), and Native (1%) Americans. The "other" category was used by 5%. The modal income of their family of origin, as well as their current household income, was between $50,000-$74, 999. Respondents reported growing up primarily in suburban (50%) as

opposed to rural (25%) and urban (21%) areas. However, this pattern changed for where they currently live, with the majority living in urban (58%) as opposed to suburban (29%) and rural (9 %) areas. Most of the respondents reported living in Great Lakes/Midwestern states (26%), Pacific Coast states (17%), mid Atlantic states (17%), and Southern states (17%). Forty-seven percent were partnered; 43% were single, and 1% were either separated or their partner was deceased. Religious orientation of their family of origin was predominantly Christianity (78%), followed by None (7%), Judaism (5%), and Agnostic/Atheist (3%). In contrast, participants reported their current religious orientation as None (31%), Christianity (27%), Agnostic/Atheist (14%), a Gay Place of Worship (7%), Judaism (4%), and Native American or Indigenous Tradition (4%).

Revised Web Page Survey

We received a considerable amount of feedback from participants regarding the GALOSI, which indicated to us that major revisions were needed in order to create a more meaningful and psychometrically sound instrument. This feedback resulted in the removal of negatively worded items (which created double negatives with the Frequency Scale), rewording some items to make them more applicable to the LG population, and the reworking of some situations to be consistent with both the Frequency and the Effect Scales. We also had a poor response rate for the GALOSI Effect scale, which was most likely the result of three factors: (a) the absence of a Non-Applicable option, (b) fatigue due to the length of the instrument, and (c) respondents having to rate each of the 133 items twice in succession, first for Frequency and then for Effect. Problems with the Effect scale itself also prompted us to make further revisions. We changed the instruction from Effect to Negative Effect to emphasize the adverse impact of these situations; we added a Non-Applicable (NA) response choice, and changed anchors for the 5-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

point Likert scale to 1 (None), 2 (Slight), 3 (Moderate), 4 (Strong), and 5 (Extremely Strong). We separated the Frequency and Effect scales so that respondents would rate all GALOSI items first for Frequency and then a second time for Effect. Respondents were instructed to choose NA (Non-Applicable) for any situation they had not experienced. Instructions were modified to read: "Gay men and lesbians often encounter discrimination, prejudice, and negative stereotypes based on their sexual orientation. Below are situations that you may have encountered. Think about each situation and indicate the level of the negative effect it has had on you. (Choose N/A if the situation does not apply to you)." A Non-Applicable (NA) response option was also added to the Frequency Scale, and instructions were modified accordingly.

Poor items were deleted or revised based on the following criteria: (a) Respondent feedback on problematic items, (b) a review of item content to rectify problematic items, and (c) the elimination of items that most participants did not answer. The revised GALOSI had 66 items. We then identified potential factors for these GALOSI items based on the remaining items and the literature, and we also adapted several of Adams' (1990) indices of racism that we thought were relevant to lesbians and gay men. These seven hypothesized factors for the revised GALOSI were: (a) Couples Issues (n = 5), (b) Danger to Safety (n = 6), (c) Exclusion and Separation (n = 14), (d) Internalized Homonegativity (n = 14), (e) Restricted Opportunities and Rights (n = 4), (f) Stigmatizing and Stereotyping (n = 14), and (g) Verbal Harassment and Intimidation (n = 9).

We also added three questions to the demographic questionnaire pertaining to "degree of outness" (at work, with your biological family, and in general). These items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (0-5% [almost no one knows]) to 7 (96-100% [almost everyone knows]). Finally, we changed the fixed order of instrument presentation so that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

participants completed the GALOSI-F and the GALOSI-E after the demographic questionnaire, with the IM scale last.

Participants

Although 300 participants completed the on-line survey, we had to eliminate seven respondents who didn't respond to 10 or more of the Frequency and/or Effect items. Participants were 112 self-identified lesbians (38.2%) and 165 gay men (56.3%) 18 years of age or older; 15 (5.1%) did not specify their sex. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 76 years old (M = 33.25, SD = 14.32). The majority were European Americans (73.4%), with much smaller percentages of African (7.8%), Latino (2.4%), Biracial (2.4%), Asian (1.4%), and Native (< 1%) Americans. The "Other" category was used by 5.8%. The modal income of their family of origin was between $35,000-$49,999. Forty-one percent reported their current household income was between $35,000-$74, 999. Respondents reported growing up primarily in suburban (49%) as opposed to rural (26%) and urban (21%) areas. However, this pattern changed for where they currently live, with the majority living in urban (55%) as opposed to suburban (26%) and rural (11%) areas. Most of the respondents reported living in Southern (28%), Rocky Mountain (16%), Mid-Atlantic (15%) and Great Lakes/Midwestern (15%) states. Forty-seven percent were partnered; 40% were single; 2% were separated, and 1% said that their partner was deceased. Religious affiliation of their family of origin was predominantly Christianity (76%), followed by Judaism (7.2%), None (4%), and Other (4%). Participants reported their current religious orientation as Christianity (30%), None (25%), Agnostic/Atheist (7%), Judaism (7%), and a Gay Place of Worship (6%).

Fifty-one percent reported being completely out at work; 57% were out to their family of origin, and 41% reported being open about their sexual orientation in general. In contrast, 12%

were not out at work; 7% were not out to their family of origin, and 2% were not open about their sexual orientation in general.

Measures and Procedure

The on-line GALOSI survey was reactivated with the same informed consent procedure that was described previously. Participants who provided informed consent then completed the demographic questionnaire, the 66-item GALOSI for Frequency, and again for Effect, and the 20-item IM, as a measure of discriminant validity. Electronic announcements were again posted as previously described. We also posted announcements on sites for lesbians and gay men of color to increase the response rate of lesbians and racial/ethnic minorities.

Results

Missing data, which resulted from participants choosing the Non-Applicable response option, precluded the use of exploratory factor analysis for the entire data set. Therefore, separate subscale analyses and reliability estimates were conducted for each of seven hypothesized GALOSI scales. Using each hypothesized scale as the unit for analysis, we employed a combination of factor analysis with maximum likelihood extraction (to ensure that the scale was measuring a single entity) and reliability analysis (to make sure that the items were highly correlated). Through the initial set of factor analyses, items were dropped when they loaded high on a second factor. For the remaining items, Cronbach alphas were calculated, and additional items were eliminated to maximize scale reliabilities.

Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency (GALOSI-F)

Factor Analysis

For Couples Issues, one item was dropped from the EFA so that one factor could be extracted, with 48% of the variance explained (eigenvalue = 1.93); however, the χ^2 for the

remaining four items was nonsignificant, which suggests that this scale needs additional refinement. For Danger to Safety, one item was deleted so that one factor could be extracted, with the $\chi^2(5) = 24.77$, $p < .0001$. The remaining five items explained 53% of the variance (eigenvalue = 2.67). For Exclusion, Rejection, & Separation, five items were deleted so that one factor could be extracted, with the $\chi^2(27) = 91.12$, $p < .0001$. The remaining nine items explained 50% of the variance (eigenvalue = 2.47). For Internalized Homonegativity, four items were deleted so that one factor could be extracted, with $\chi^2(35) = 109.39$, $p < .0001$. The remaining 10 items accounted for 51% of the variance (eigenvalue = 5.05). For Restricted Opportunities and Rights, one item was removed based on estimates of internal consistency. The three remaining items explained 62% of the variance explained (eigenvalue = 1.86); however, no χ^2 was reported. This analysis suggests that more items must be added to improve this scale. For Stigmatizing and Stereotyping, three items were deleted to create a one-factor solution, with $\chi^2(44) = 84.39$, $p < .0001$. The remaining 11 items explained 43% of the variance (eigenvalue = 4.74). For Verbal Harassment and Intimidation, two items were eliminated to extract a one-factor solution, with $\chi^2(14) = 38.46$, $p < .0001$. The remaining seven items explained 44% of the variance (eigenvalue = 3.07).

Descriptive Statistics

Based on these analyses, the GALOSI-F was reduced to 49 items. These items, their corresponding scales, means, standard deviations, and scale Cronbach alphas are presented in Table 1. GALOSI-F scale means indicate that the participants reported experiencing Stigmatizing and Stereotyping almost always. Verbal Harassment and Intimidation, Couples Issues, and Danger to Safety often. Exclusion, Rejection, and Separation and Internalized Homonegativity mid-way between often and sometimes, and Restricted Opportunities and Rights

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sometimes. Coefficients of internal consistency ranged from .63 (Couples Issues) to .88 (Internalized Homonegativity), with three scales having alphas > .80 (Internalized Homonegativity, Exclusion, Rejection, & Separation, and Stigmatizing & Stereotyping), and two > .70 (Danger to Safety and Verbal Harassment & Intimidation). The remaining two scales (Couples Issues and Restriction of Opportunities & Rights) had alphas < .70, which further indicates that these two scales need to be revised.

Insert Table 1 About Here

All of the intercorrelations among the GALOSI-F factors were significant and ranged from .16 to .78. Refer to Table 2.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Discriminant Validity

The correlations among the GALSOI-F factors and the Impression Management scale were examined to provide estimates of discriminant validity. These correlations, which are presented in Table 2, ranged from -.15 to .02. The low and nonsignificant correlations suggest that there is no association between socially desirable responding and the GALOSI-F scales.

Criterion-Related Validity

The group difference method was used to help establish criterion validity of the GALOSI-F. For these and all subsequent significant results, Tukey HSD post hoc comparisons were used to explore multiple group comparisons. Effect sizes (η^2) also were calculated. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

evaluation of effect size was based on Cohen's (1988) criteria, where η^2s from .01 to .04 are small; η^2 from .05 to .13 are moderate, and η^2s greater than .13 are large.

GALOSI-F scale means and standard deviations by gender and race/ethnicity are presented in Table 3. Due to small numbers, groups of racial/ethnic minorities were combined into one group (People of Color) and compared with European Americans. A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Race/Ethnicity) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the seven GALOSI-F scales. Large amounts of missing data reduced the sample size (N = 103). Only one significant effect was found for Gender, Wilks' Λ = .77, $F(14, 103) = 1.83$, $p < .04$, $\eta^2 = .12$. However, follow-up univariate analyses were not significant.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Effect (GALOSI-E)

Factor Analysis

For Couples Issues, two items were dropped from the EFA so that one factor could be extracted, with 69% of the variance explained (eigenvalue = 2.06); however, for the remaining three items the χ^2 was nonsignificant, which suggests that more items must be added to this scale. For Danger to Safety, one factor could be extracted, with $\chi^2(9) = 126.08$, $p < .0001$. These six items explained 65% of the variance (eigenvalue = 3.87). For Exclusion, Rejection, & Separation, four items were deleted so that one factor could be extracted, with the $\chi^2(35) = 136.98$, $p < .0001$. The remaining 10 items explained 61% of the variance (eigenvalue = 6.12). For Internalized Homonegativity, four items were deleted so that one factor could be extracted, with $\chi^2(35) = 86.09$, $p < .0001$. The remaining 10 items accounted for 56% of the variance

(eigenvalue = 5.58). An additional item was dropped to maximize the scale's internal consistency; therefore, the final scale has nine items. For Restricted Opportunities and Rights, one factor with three items was extracted that accounted for 70% of the variance (eigenvalue = 69.94); however, no χ^2 was reported. This analysis suggests that more items must be added to improve this scale. For Stigmatizing and Stereotyping, six items were deleted to create a one-factor solution, with $\chi^2(20) = 72.13$, $p < .0001$. The remaining eight items explained 56% of the variance (eigenvalue = 4.48). For Verbal Harassment and Intimidation, one item was deleted in order to extract a one-factor solution, with $\chi^2(20) = 82.17$, $p < .0001$. The remaining eight items explained 48% of the variance (eigenvalue = 3.86).

Descriptive Statistics

Based on these analyses, the GALOSI-E was reduced to 47 items. These items, their corresponding scales, means, standard deviations, and scale Cronbach alphas are presented in Table 1. GALOSI-E scale means indicate that participants reported having experienced extremely strong negative effects from Stigmatizing and Stereotyping, strong effects from Couples Issues and Verbal Harassment and Intimidation, mid-way between moderate and strong effects for Exclusion, Rejection, and Separation, Internalized Homonegativity, and Danger to Safety, and moderate effects for Restricted Opportunities and Rights. Coefficients of internal consistency ranged from .77 (Couples Issues) to .93 (Exclusion, Rejection, and Separation), with five scales having alphas > .80 (Exclusion, Rejection, & Separation, Internalized Homonegativity, Stigmatizing & Stereotyping, Danger to Safety, and Stigmatizing and Stereotyping), and two $\geq$ .77 (Restricted Opportunities & Rights, and Verbal Harassment & Intimidation).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As seen in Table 2, all of the intercorrelations among the GALOSI-E scales were significant and ranged from .31 to .78. Intercorrelations among the GALOSI-F and the GALOSI-E scales ranged .11 to .87. Correlations between GALOSI-F and –E corresponding scales ranged from .70 (Stigmatizing and Stereotyping) to .87 (Internalized Homonegativity).

Discriminant Validity

The correlations among the GALSOI-E factors and the Impression Management scale were examined to provide estimates of discriminant validity. These correlations, which are presented in Table 2, ranged from -.13 to .10. The low and nonsignificant correlations suggest that there is no association between socially desirable responding and the GALOSI-E scales.

Criterion-Related Validity

The group difference method was used to help establish criterion validity of the GALOSI-E. Scale means and standard deviations by gender and race/ethnicity are presented in Table 3. Due to small numbers, groups of racial/ethnic minorities were combined into one group (People of Color) and compared with European Americans. A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Race/Ethnicity) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the seven GALOSI-E scale scores. Large amounts of missing data reduced the sample size for this analysis ($N = 94$). Only a main effect for Gender was obtained. Wilks' $\Lambda = .74$, $F(7, 64) = 2.75$, $p < .02$, $\eta^2 = .26$. Follow-up univariate analysis revealed only one significant effect for Exclusion, Rejection, and Separation. $F(1, 64) = 7.46$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$, with lesbians ($M = 36.22$, $SD = 10.90$) reporting a more negative impact than gay men ($M = 30.49$, $SD = 6.99$).

Discussion

The GALOSI scales reflect various types of heterosexism identified in the literature (Berrill, 199; DiPlacido, 1998; Garnets, Herek, & Levy, 1992; Herek, 1992; Meyer, 1995;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Waldo, 1999). Preliminary analyses suggest that five of the seven GALOSI scales evidenced good scale structure and internal consistency. However, analyses indicate that two scales (Couples Issues and Restricted Opportunities and Rights) need to be refined. Lesbians and gay men endorsed the upper ends of both frequency and effect for all scales, except for Restricted Opportunities and Rights, which was endorsed in the mid-range. This response pattern suggests that lesbians and gay men frequently encounter heterosexist situations, and that these oppressive situations have a strong negative effect on them.

Criterion-related validity was demonstrated by a significant Gender MANOVA effect. For the GALOSI-F a moderate effect size was obtained, and for the GALOSI-E, a large effect size was reported. Additional investigations of group differences need to be conducted with larger numbers of lesbians and gay men of color to provide an adequate test of potential Race Ethnicity effects.

Data are currently being collected on-line to ascertain the structural, convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity of the GALOSI-F and the GALOSI-E. Test-retest reliability data are being gathered as well.

We hope that the GALOSI-F & E will eventually be a psychometrically sound instrument that can be used to study important issues, such as the impact of minority stress on lesbians and gay men

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Adams, P. L. (1990). Prejudice and exclusion as social traumata in J. D. Noshpitz & R. D. Coddington (Eds.), Stressors and the adjustment disorders (pp. 362-391). NY: John Wiley.

Berrill, K. T. (1992). Anti-gay violence and victimization in the United States: An overview. In G. M. Herek & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men (pp. 19-45). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Brooks, V. R. (1981). Minority stress and lesbian women. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Comstock, G. D. (1989). Victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, 101-106.

DiPlacido, J. (1998). Minority stress among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals: A consequence of heterosexism, homophobia, and stigmatization. In G. M. Herek's (Ed.), Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals (Vol 4, pp. 138-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fernald, J. L. (1995). Interpersonal sexism. In B. Lott & D. Maluso's (Eds.), The social psychology of interpersonal discrimination (pp. 80-117). NY: Guilford.

Frable, D.E.S., Wortman, C., & Joseph, J. (1997). Predicting self-esteem, well-being, and distress in a cohort of gay men: The importance of cultural stigma, personal visibility, community networks, and positive identity. Journal of Personality, 65, 599-624.

Greene, B. (1996). Lesbians and gay men of color: The legacy of ethnosexual mythologies in heterosexism. In E. D. Rothblum & L. A. Bond (Eds.), Preventing heterosexism and homphobia (Vol. 4, pp. 59-70). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Herek, G. M. (1992). The social context of hate crimes: Notes on cultural heterosexism. In G. M. Herek & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men (pp. 89-103). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Herek, G. M. (1995). The impact of psychological heterosexism in the United States. In A. R. D'Augelli & C. J. Patterson (Eds.), Lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities over the lifespan (pp. 321-346). New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 36, 38-56.

Meyer, I. H., & Dean, L. (1998). Internalized homophobia, intimacy, and sexual behavior among gay and bisexual men. In G. N. Herek's (Ed.), Stigma and sexual orientation (Vol 4, pp.160186). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes (p. 17-51). San Diego: Academic Press.

Ross, M. W. (1996). Societal reaction and homosexuality: Culture, acculturation, life events, and social supports as mediators of response to homonegative attitudes. In E. D. Rothblum & L. A. Bond (Eds.), Preventing heterosexism and homophobia (pp. 205-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rosser, B.S., & Ross, M.W. (1989). A Gay Life Events Scale (GALES) for homosexual men. Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy, 2, 87-101.

von Schulthess, B. (1992). Violence in the streets: Anti-lesbian assault and harassment in San Francisco. In G. M. Herek & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), Hate Crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men (pp. 65-75). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Waldo, C. R. (1999). Working in a majority context: A structural model of heterosexism as minority stress in the workplace. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46, 218-232.

Waldo, C.R., Hesson-McInnis, M.S., & D'Augelli, R. (1998). Antecedents and consequences of victimization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual young people: A structural model comparing rural university and urban samples. American Journal of Community Psychology, 26, 307-334.

Table 1

GALOSI-F & E Item Means and Standard Deviations, and Scale Internal Consistency

Scale / Item	GALOSI-F				GALOSI-E			
	M	SD	n	α	M	SD	n	α
Couples Issues (GALOSI-F n = 4, GALOSI-E n = 3)	16.76	3.29	202	.63	11.98	3.11	211	.77
(2.) I have been uncomfortable about introducing my partner/girlfriend/boyfriend to biological family members.	3.78	1.31	256		3.83	1.28	247	
(36.) I have seen that it is harder for gays to have children than it is for heterosexuals.	4.73	1.05	263		--	--	--	
(44.) I have been uncomfortable about bringing my partner/girlfriend/boyfriend to work-related social events.	3.58	1.33	233		3.78	1.35	222	
(48.) I have been afraid to publicly display affection for my partner/girlfriend/boyfriend.	4.44	1.12	272		4.33	1.22	264	
Dangers to Safety (GALOSI-F n = 5) (GALOSI-E n = 6)	19.05	3.96	265	.77	21.12	6.45	155	.89
(18.) I have been physically threatened because of my gayness.	2.86	.86	288		3.56	1.51	219	
(35.) I have known gay people who committed suicide.	2.99	.96	282		3.77	1.44	220	
(49.) I have been afraid of being physically injured because of my gayness.	3.73	1.02	290		3.99	1.30	271	
(50.) I have known gay people who have attempted suicide.	3.33	1.09	281		3.93	1.40	232	
(51.) I have been physically injured because of my gayness.	2.35	.68	284		3.01	1.41	176	
(57.) I have known people who have been physically injured because of their gayness.	3.71	.95	288		4.27	1.29	258	
Exclusion, Rejection, & Separation GALOSI-F n = 9; GALOSI-E n = 10)	31.28	7.11	235	.87	35.56	10.23	150	.93
(3.) People have avoided me because of my gayness.	--	--	--		3.45	.97	275	
(13.) I have felt isolated by members of my biological family because of my gayness.	3.75	1.25	284		3.91	1.36	261	
(17.) People have told me to keep my gayness a secret.	3.45	.99	291		3.76	1.32	259	
(19.) I have been afraid that my family would reject me because of my gayness.	4.08	1.24	291		4.29	1.40	279	
(24.) My biological family has denied the existence of gay family members.	3.16	1.31	257		3.41	1.36	210	
(26.) Biological family members have rejected me because of my gayness.	2.84	1.09	269		3.39	1.45	208	

(table continues)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(31.) I have had biological family members ask me to pretend that I am not gay.	2.82	1.16	279		3.55	1.47	211	
(46.) I have worried that people would avoid me because of my gayness.	--	--	--		3.68	1.13	279	
(47.) I have had to think about how much of my gayness to share with new people.	4.52	1.11	292		--	--	--	
(54.) Members of my biological family have acted like gayness is wrong.	3.95	1.24	287		4.16	1.31	265	
(60.) Friends have rejected me because of my gayness.	3.02	.83	282		3.47	1.19	241	
Internalized Homonegativity (GALOSI-F n = 10; GALOSI-E n = 9)	35.14	7.71	230	.88	36.00	9.90	141	
(25.) I have hidden my gayness so that people would like me.	3.37	1.05	290		3.76	1.22	256	.91
(28.) My gayness has been in conflict with my religious beliefs.	3.63	1.49	254		3.81	1.52	220	
(29.) I have had to hide my gayness to be accepted by members of my biological family.	3.40	1.31	276		3.78	1.40	249	
(33.) It has been hard for me to feel good about myself because of people's negative views about my gayness.	3.50	1.02	291		3.58	1.24	277	
(38.) It has been hard for me to accept my gayness.	3.36	.99	288		3.60	1.26	265	
(39.) I have worried that people would be upset if I were out about being gay.	3.71	1.11	291		3.84	1.21	278	
(43.) I have denied my gayness.	3.29	.98	289		3.75	1.31	259	
(56.) I have felt depressed about my gayness.	3.47	1.00	291		3.78	1.30	268	
(64.) I have worried that I will go to hell because of my gayness.	2.81	1.09	277		3.34	1.53	220	
(66.) I have worried about disapproval, when I have shared my gayness with heterosexuals.	4.08	1.08	289		--	--	--	
Restricted Opportunities & Rights (n = 3)	9.99	1.85	210	.69	8.37	2.89	134	.78
(7.) Advancement opportunities at work have been limited because of my gayness.	3.00	1.11	242		3.20	1.33	198	
(42.) I have been denied employment because of my gayness.	2.56	.91	258		3.00	1.29	184	
(45.) I have been denied housing because of my gayness.	2.33	.74	260		2.61	1.05	157	
Stigmatizing & Stereotyping (GALOSI-F n = 11; GALOSI-E n = 8)	50.14	6.59	235	.85	34.85	6.54	247	.88
(4.) I have seen the media negatively portray gays and lesbians.	4.83	.67	292		--	--	--	
(11.) I have seen people assume that gay men are HIV+.	4.15	.95	287		4.04	1.10	291	
(14.) I have seen people assume that gay men exhibit indecent and flamboyant behavior.	4.71	.78	290		4.12	1.10	289	
(21.) When I was growing up, my religion preached that gayness is wrong.	4.94	1.45	261		--	--	--	

(table continues)

(22.) I have seen people assume that lesbians are overly masculine women.	4.92	.60	290		--	--	--	
(30.) I have known heterosexuals who think that gays are child molesters.	4.17	.99	287		4.61	1.22	280	
(53.) I have been stereotyped based on my gayness.	3.94	.98	285		3.95	1.15	275	
(58.) I have gotten the message that gayness is undesirable.	4.55	.98	290		4.58	1.14	284	
(59.) I have seen people assume that gay men have AIDS.	4.42	.88	292		4.27	1.10	290	
(61.) I have seen the media stereotype gays and lesbians.	--	--	--		4.67	1.01	291	
(63.) I have seen people assume that lesbians hate men.	4.56	.92	288		4.26	1.14	281	
(65.) I have seen parents teach their children that gayness is disgusting.	4.43	.98	286		--	--	--	
Verbal Harassment & Intimidation (GALOSI-F n = 7; GALOSI-E n = 8)	28.27	4.14	278	.77	31.90	6.29	192	.84
(1.) I have had anti-gay remarks directed at me.	3.63	.77	291		--	--	--	
(6.) I have heard people telling gay-bashing jokes.	4.38	.92	292		4.37	1.07	288	
(10.) Members of my biological family have made anti-gay remarks.	3.58	1.01	291		4.06	1.35	270	
(15.) People have stared at me because I look gay.	--	--	--		3.29	1.54	246	
(16.) People have treated me differently if they think I am gay	3.83	.84	287		3.79	1.03	282	
(20.) I have been the butt of anti-gay jokes.	--	--	--		3.40	1.25	236	
(23.) I have seen anti-gay graffiti in public places.	4.02	.95	291		3.87	1.10	275	
(32.) I have heard people making negative remarks about gays	4.60	.71	292		4.68	1.01	293	
(62.) I have seen people tell lesbians that all they need is a good man	4.25	1.14	288		4.38	1.30	280	

Note GALOSI-F = Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency; = Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency, . CI = Couples Issues (scores range from 4-20); DS = Danger to Safety (scores range from 5-25); ERS = Exclusion, Rejection, & Separation (scores range from 9-45); IH = Internalized Homonegativity (scores range from 10-50); ROR = Restricted Opportunities & Rights (scores range from 3-15); SS = Stigmatizing & Stereotyping (scores range from 11-55); VHI = Verbal Harassment & Intimidation (scores range from 7-35); GALOSI-E = Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory (scores range from 47-235; CI = Couples Issues (scores range from 5-15); DS = Danger to Safety (scores range from 6-30); ERS = Exclusion, Rejection & Separation (scores range from 10-50); IH = Internalized Homonegativity (scores range 10 -50); ROR = Restricted Opportunities & Rights (scores range from 3-15); SS = Stigmatizing & Stereotyping (scores range from 8-40); VHI = Verbal Harassment & Intimidation (scores range from 8-40

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Intercorrelations Among Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency & Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Effect Scales and Impression Management

	GALOSI-F								GALOSI-E								
GALOSI-F	CI	DS	ERS	III	ROR	SS	VIII	FS	CI	DS	ERS	III	ROR	SS	VIII	FS	IM
CI	--	16*	62**	69**	25**	32**	45**	.75**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.02
DS	--	--	32**	29**	49**	41**	55**	.49**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.02
ERS	--	--	--	65**	35**	56**	60**	.88**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.01
III	--	--	--	--	23**	49**	50**	.86**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.10
ROR	--	--	--	--	--	54**	48**	.53**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.08
SS	--	--	--	--	--	--	78**	.80**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.03
VIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	84**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.15*
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.22*
GALOSI-E																	
CI	79**	26**	54**	68**	13	32**	43**	.65**	--	.34**	.55**	.75**	.31**	.39**	.54**	.67**	.09
DS	11	82**	25**	26**	41**	40**	48**	.37**	--	--	.57**	.52**	.52**	.50**	.66**	.71**	.03
ERS	51**	39**	84**	60**	31**	55**	57**	.73**	--	--		.73**	.50**	.51**	.67**	.84**	.08
III	63**	37**	56**	87**	36**	43**	42**	.81**	--	--	--	--	.31**	.47**	.64**	.82**	-.02
ROR	30**	43**	36**	20*	77**	41**	40**	.41**	--	--	--	--	--	.32**	.48**	.58**	.10
SS	25**	46**	35	43**	39**	70**	61**	.61**	--	--	--	--	--	--	.78**	.80**	.01
VIII	35**	50**	48**	51**	35**	64**	71**	.73**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.86**	-.13
Total	45**	61**	74**	67**	42**	66**	73**	.86**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.05

Note. GALOSI-F = Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency; CI = Couples Issues; DS = Danger to Safety; ERS = Exclusion, Rejection, & Separation; III = Internalized Homonegativity; ROR = Restricted Opportunities & Rights; SS Stigmatizing & Stereotyping; VIII = Verbal Harassment & Intimidation; Total = Full Scale; GALOSI-E = Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Effect; CI = Couples Issues; DS = Danger to Safety; ERS = Exclusion, Rejection & Separation; III = Internalized Homonegativity; ROR = Restricted Opportunities & Rights; SS = Stigmatizing & Stereotyping; VIII = Verbal Harassment & Intimidation; Total = Full Scale.

*p < .05. **p < .01.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

GALOSI-F & -E Means, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients by Gender and Race/Ethnicity

	Lesbians (n = 38)		Gay Men (n = 64)		European American (n = 89)		People of Color (n = 14)	
GALOSI-F	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
CI	16.42	3.13	16.98	3.38	16.69	3.16	17.14	4.06
DS	18.26	3.47	19.34	3.64	18.78	3.60	20.00	3.42
ERS	31.92	7.67	30.20	6.81	30.71	6.92	31.43	8.62
IH	33.34	6.93	35.41	8.53	34.19	7.32	36.86	11.58
ROR	10.05	1.52	9.88	1.76	9.94	1.69	10.07	1.64
SS	49.76	5.61	49.66	6.09	49.22	5.47	53.00	7.38
VHI	28.40	3.63	28.02	3.74	27.89	3.42	29.71	4.84
Total	188.16	23.94	189.48	27.13	187.41	23.48	198.21	37.01
GALOSI-E								
CI	11.30	3.62	11.51	3.18	11.46	3.24	11.36	3.71
DS	19.96	6.23	19.95	5.50	20.10	5.85	19.43	5.40
ERS	36.22	10.90	30.49	6.99	32.20	8.52	33.79	10.65
IH	32.26	7.89	33.27	7.67	33.04	7.92	32.43	7.12
ROR	8.70	3.44	7.98	2.72	8.300	3.08	8.00	2.75
SS	35.13	6.87	35.00	6.07	34.84	6.24	35.79	6.77
VHI	31.70	6.70	29.98	5.54	30.52	6.01	30.86	6.13
Total	175.26	38.50	168.17	27.85	170.46	31.49	171.64	34.83

Note. GALOSI-F = Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency; = Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency; ; CI = Couples Issues (scores range from 4-20); DS = Danger to Safety (scores range from 5-25); ERS = Exclusion, Rejection, & Separation (scores range from 9-45); IH = Internalized Homonegativity (scores range from 10-50); ROR = Restricted Opportunities & Rights (scores range from 3-15); SS = Stigmatizing & Stereotyping (scores range from 11-55); VHI = Verbal Harassment & Intimidation (scores range from 7-35); GALOSI-E = Gay And Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory (scores range from 47-235; CI = Couples Issues (scores range from 5-15); DS = Danger to Safety (scores range from 6-30); ERS = Exclusion, Rejection & Separation (scores range from 10-50); IH = Internalized Homonegativity (scores range 10 -50); ROR = Restricted Opportunities & Rights (scores range from 3-15); SS = Stigmatizing & Stereotyping (scores range from 8-40); VHI = Verbal Harassment & Intimidation (scores range from 8-40)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE